

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****NOV 19 2007****OLYMPIC PATENT WORKS[®] PLLC****705 SECOND AVE. SUITE 1111
SEATTLE, WA 98104****MAILING ADDRESS:
P.O. BOX 4277
SEATTLE, WA 98194-0277****206.621.1933 (MAIN)
206.621.5302 (FAX)****FAX TRANSMISSION COVER SHEET**

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS COMMUNICATION IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE ADDRESSEE AND MAY BE CONFIDENTIAL, MAY BE PROTECTED BY THE ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE AND MAY CONSTITUTE INSIDE INFORMATION. UNAUTHORIZED USE, DISCLOSURE OR COPYING IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED, AND MAY BE UNLAWFUL. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY ME AT 206.621.1933.

FROM: Joanne Bourguignon**DATE: November 19, 2007**

Serial No. 10/773,890

Filed: February 6, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 10030771-1

TOTAL PAGES TO BE SENT (including this cover sheet): 17**SEND TO:**

NAME	COMPANY	TELEPHONE	FAX
CHRISTOPHER LOW	PTO	571.272.0519	571.273.8300

In response to the Petition Decision (copy attached) dated October 22, 2007 re the above-identified matter, Acting Director Christopher Low advised that a response to the Office Action mailed May 22, 2007, cannot be found in the file and should be resubmitted with evidence of prior submission. Applicant's representative submits herewith a copy of the Amendment and support documents that were timely filed on August 22, 2007. Please note that a copy of the stamped return-receipt postcard is also attached, which confirms the filing and the PTO receipt.

Should the Acting Director have any questions or require additional information, he is invited to contact Applicant's representative at 206.621.1933.

Robert W. Bergstrom
Reg. No. 39,906



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

OCT 22 2007

 RECEIVED
 CENTRAL FAX CENTER
 NOV 19 2007

 Commissioner for Patents
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

 AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
 LEGAL DEPARTMENT, DL429
 INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
 P.O. BOX 7599
 LOVELAND CO 80537-0599

COPY

In re Application of
 Srinka Ghosh
 Serial No.: 10/773,890
 Filed: February 6, 2004
 Attorney Docket No.: 10030771-1

:
 :
 : PETITION DECISION
 :
 :

This is in response to the petition under 37 CFR 1.144, filed September 24, 2007, requesting withdrawal of an improper restriction requirement.

BACKGROUND

A review of the file history shows that this application was filed under 35 U.S.C. 111 on February 6, 2004, and contained claims 1-26. In a first Office action, mailed August 30, 2006, the examiner required restriction, as follows:

- Group I – Claims 1-14 and 25 drawn to a method of processing microarray data;
- Group II – Claim 15 drawn feature signal data; and
- Group III – Claims 16-24 and 26 drawn to a system for processing microarray data.

An election of species was also required for Group I, if elected.

The examiner reasoned that the system (apparatus) and method of use were separate and distinct inventions and were also different from the raw data of Group II.

Applicants replied on October 16, 2006, electing Group III with traverse. Applicants argued that the examiner has failed to establish that Groups I and III were separate and distinct and that the same process steps were employed in both and there would be no burden to consider both together.

The examiner mailed a new Office action to applicants on May 22, 2007, acknowledging the election of Group III, but maintaining the requirement and making it Final. The examiner maintained the argument that the process and apparatus claims were distinct inventions. Claims

COPY

2

16-24 and 26 were then rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as indefinite and explained why. Claims 16-24 and 26 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Finally, claims 16-24 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as anticipated by Bozinov.

This petition was filed on September 24, 2007, and traverses the finality of the restriction requirement as in error. **Note** - Applicants indicate that a reply to the merits of the Office action was filed on August 22, 2007, but such reply cannot be found in the file and should be resubmitted with evidence of prior submission to avoid extension of time fees.

DISCUSSION

Applicants' petition appears to be primarily directed to the restriction between Groups I and III and that since the same four process steps appear in each independent claim they should be examined together since a search for the process steps would be required for each one. Further, the only significant difference between the claim sets is the presence of a processor (i.e. a computer) which does not lend novelty to the claim set. A review of applicants' arguments and the claim sets involved show applicants' arguments to be correct. In view thereof the Groups should be examined together.

Applicants also briefly traverse the restriction with respect to Group II. A review of Claim 15 (Group II) shows that it is directed to a data set only and is considered non-statutory as it stands. In view of this it will not be rejoined with Groups I and III.

DECISION

The petition is **GRANTED**. The restriction requirement between Groups I and III is withdrawn and these claims will be examined together. Any response should address the rejections of record as if they applied to all of the claims of these two Groups.

Applicants remain under obligation to reply to the Office action mailed May 22, 2007, within the time period set therein or as extended under 37 CFR 1.136(a), (unless such response has been filed – see note above).

Should there be any questions about this decision please contact William R. Dixon, Jr., by letter addressed to Director, TC 1600, at the address listed above, or by telephone at 571-272-0519 or by facsimile sent to the general Office facsimile number, 571-273-8300.



Christopher Low
Acting Director, Technology Center 1600